DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 167 CG 010 497

AUTHOR Courtois, Christine; Sedlacek, William E.
TITLE Sex Differences in Perceptions of Female Success. Research Report No. 2-75
INSTITUTION Maryland Uni ., College Park. Counseling Center.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Tests; College Students; Females; Psychological Studies; Research Projects; *Role Perception; *Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes; *Social Attitudes; Socialization; *Success Factors

ABSTRACT

. scale to measure fear of women's success (SASWS) modeled after the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was administered to 59 upperclass students (33 females, 26 males). Results indicate that both men and women feel that male success is more expected and believable in our society. However, the hypothesis that women show a greater tendency to avoid success was not supported. The situation showing the greatest disparity in support between men and women was where a woman is named head of the Engineering Department. Women were more positive toward this than men. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible .. the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED122167

COUNSELING CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 010 497

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

SEX DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE SUCCESS

Christine Courtois and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 2-75

SUMMARY

A scale to measure fear of women's success (SASWS) modeled after the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was administered to 59 upperclass students (33 females, 26 males). Results indicate that both men and women feel that male success is more expected and believable in our society. However, the hypothesis that women show a greater tendency to avoid success was not supported. The situation showing the greatest disparity in support between men and women was where a woman is named head of the Engineering Department. Women were more positive toward this than men.

American society places a premium on achievement and individuals who are motivated to achieve. Individual initiative, independence and self-reliance, the work ethic, the "self-made" man, and Horatio Alger type success have all been promoted and reinforced within the American culture. American young are socialized from birth to value and work toward success and achievement. Further socialization takes place along another dimension, that of sex appropriate behavior as defined by the culture. Historically, role stereotyping has been shaped quite distinctly by sex. Males are taught that masculinity equates with action, assertion, aggressiveness and dominance, while females are taught that femininity incorporates dependence, nurturance, deference, acceptance and passivity. Research on sex stereotyping during the past several years has increasingly indicated that such sex role stereotyping and achievement valued socialization in America presents a consistent image to males and an inconsistent one to females (Herman, 1974). Females receive the message that achievement and femininity are valued, but that they are incompatible almost to the point of being mutually exclusive (Horner, 1969). The contradictory encouragement for a female is that she be smart and independent but that she not be too much so or she will be "unfeminine" according to society's conceptualization of feminine. If she is unfeminine she will be unpopular with men, socially isolated, and will never be married, with marriage presupposed as the ultimate success for females in our society. Confusion and anxiety may appear in the maturing female as she becomes increasingly aware that academic and intellectual pursuits of human fulfillment contrast with culturally defined feminine fulfillment. For males, on the other hand, achievement and masculine attributes seem to flow from each other. Males for the most part avoid the dilemma faced by females since they are taught from birth that human fulfillment and masculine fulfillment are one and the same. The

issue of a male's masculinity is not called into question over a man's motivation to succeed, but rather, one reinforces the other; the opposite is true for females (Bardwick, 1971).

Sex role stereotyping has even been shown to affect the way in which mental health is viewed in our culture in the work of Broverman et al. (1970). These researchers demonstrated a relationship between the masculine stereotype and clinical opinions of mental health, while the feminine stereotype is closely aligned with poor mental health. Heilbrun (1963), in conducting a study of sex role identity and achievement motivation of college age individuals, concluded that the greater the female sex role adoption of the late adolescent, the greater the sex role confusion among those participating in a competitive higher education program. Confusion was restricted to those behaviors relevant to achievement motivation, a point especially pertinent to this study.

Early achievement research dates from the 1950's, with the most definitive work conducted by McClelland et al. (1953). They defined achievement motivation as a function of the strength of a motive to approach success minus the strength of the motive to avoid failure, with these two motivations determining each motive. Women became conspicuous by their absence in almost all achievement studies; the data on achievement motivation pertained nearly exclusively to men. When females were included, results were contradictory and confusing. French & Lesser (1964) noted the inconsistency in achievement motivation experiments using female subjects, although experiments with males yielded consistent results. Mead (1949) concluded that while men seemed to be unsexed by failure, women are unsexed by success; and Maccoby (1963) has written that a female who maintains independence and striving for intellectual development is in defiance of sex appropriate behavior and must pay a price in anxiety.

Horner (1972) incorporated the concepts of conflict, anxiety, and sex inappropriate behavior with relevent achievement motivation research in the development of her theoretical construct, the Motive to Avoid Success (M-s). Horner's theory was developed within a framework of the research on achievement motivation for men. She theorized that a fear of success was operational and anxiety-producing for women, rather than the motive to achieve success or motive to avoid failure found in men. She explained her synthesis:

> "I argued that most women have a motive to avoid success, that is, a disposition to become anxious about achieving success because they expect negative consequences (such as social rejection and/or feeling of being unfeminine) as a result of succeeding. Note that this is not to say that most women 'want to fail' or have a motive to avoid failure. The presence of a 'will to fail' would, in accordance with the theory, imply that they actively seek out failure because they anticipate or expect positive consequences from failing. The presence of a motive to avoid success, on the other hand, implies that the expression of the achievement-directed tendencies of most otherwise positively-motivated young women is inhibited by the arousal of a thwarting disposition to be anxious about the negative consequences they expect will follow the desired success." (Horner 1972, p. 159).

Horner (1969) proposes that the motive to avoid success is in fact a major variable within the previously unresolved sex differences found in achievement motivation data. She tested her hypothesis in her original study by asking 178 college students to write 4 minute stories to her thematic cue: "At the end of first-term finals, Anne finds herself at the top of her medical school class." Males wrote about John in this situation, females about Anne. Horner, in examining the responses, classified them into three themes she found to be

congruent with her theory of the motive to avoid success: (1) social rejection, (2) fears and negative feelings because of success, and (3) bizarre or hostile responses or complete denial of the cue. In this particular study, 65% of the females and fewer than 10% of the males showed evidence of fear of success. Horner used several assumptions in developing this study: (1) that the motive would be more characteristic of women than of men, (2) that it would be more characteristic of women who are capable of success than those who are not, and (3) that anxiety over success would be greater in competitive situations, especially when competing with men. Horner concluded that although many barriers to female success have lessened in recent years, a psychological barrier still remains and has an important influence on the intellectual and professional attitude and lives of many women.

While Horner's work has received much acceptance, some criticisms also exist. Tresemer (1974) argued that the motive to avoid success may not be a motive at all, may have little to do with avoiding success and may not be unique to women at all. His major points of criticism were: (1) no standardization and a great deal of subjectivity exists in the scoring of fear of success, the most common error being to label all negative comments as fear of success; (2) no agreement exists as to what success is; (3) few follow-up studies have sought to relate fear of success to actual behavior, making the relationship unclear; (4) some follow-up studies have been able to replicate the original while some have not; and (5) cues such as Horner's medical school cue cannot be used to measure both a woman's motive to avoid success and a man's reaction to female success. In sum, Tresemer (1974) believes that "Horner may have found fear of sex-role inappropriateness rather than fear of success for females" (p. 85).

This study was designed as a measure of fear of success, using a technique different from thematic cues. Tresemer's points of refutation were taken into

account in the development of this instrument and in the analysis of the results. It may be advantageous therefore to view results as measuring fear of sex-inappropriate behavior rather than fear of success. The hypothesis being studied is that college women do show a greater tendency to avoid success, look negatively upon success for other women, and show greater anxiety over success than do college men.

Procedure

The instrument to be used in assessing attitudes towards achievement is modeled after the Situational Attitude Scale (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970, 1972) which measures racial attitudes. The SAS makes psychological withdrawal difficult by presenting a series of ten situations or racial contexts. There are two forms and the variable is provided by adding the work "black" to the second form. This provides the only difference in forms that would account for a resulting difference in response. The SAS methodology has been used to measure sexist attitudes among male university students (Herman and Sedlacek, 1973). They concluded that sexist attitudes are masked as are racial attitudes, but in an opposite direction. That is, presently there is some indication that it is socially desirable among men to be intolerant to changing sex roles. Successful women challenge sex roles. The scale in the current study was designed to assess how both men and women view successful women in personal, social and professional situations.

A new version of the SAS called the SASWS (Women's Success) was developed for the current study. The SASWS consists of two forms, each containing ten situations involving achievement and success followed by ten bi-polar semantic differential scales. The only difference between forms is that Form A has a reference to a female in the situation while Form B involves a male (see Appendix). The positive pole for each of the ten bi-polar responses was

varied randomly to avoid a response set. The difference between forms will be the only cause for a different response by subjects.

In several pilot studies with university women it was determined that the use of an actual name (e.g., Anne, Jim) elicited the same responses as a female noun or pronoun. Additionally, open ended responses to the situations were categorized and developed into the bi-polar scales.

The SASWS was administered to 59 juniors and seniors (33 females; 26 males) enrolled in speech classes at the University of Maryland, College Park.

The instruments were administered by a team of male and female graduate students, with each subject having an approximately equal chance of receiving either Form A or Form B. Subjects were not told that two forms were being used and administration time was approximately 30 minutes.

The responses were analyzed by two way analysis of variance with form and sex as main effects.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations for each subgroup and significance tests for each item. Results indicate that 28 of the 100 items are significantly different on form, 9 are significant on sex, and 12 are significant on the interaction of form and sex. Only 9 items would be expected to be significant by chance, (Sakoda, Cohen and Beall, 1954), so that form is highly significant, the interaction is slightly above chance, and the sex effect is exactly at chance level. Differences by form, sex and their interaction are strongest in situation v in which a woman is named Head of the Engineering Department. Generally, males are somewhat supportive yet are more ambivalent than on any other situation. Females are very supportive of a female department head. Males tend to find a male appointment more expected, more believable and more appropriate although they indicate more annoyance with a male

appointee. A female department head is cause for pleasure, hope and encouragement by both sexes, though the males indicated some pessimism. Females are consistent in their support and optimism toward a female appointee.

Situation IX shows a marked variance in response by form. Both males and females indicate they are more trusting, and content with a successful woman who has an active social life. Form is also significant on situations II, VII, VIII and X with females showing more comfort with and support for successful females in those situations. Males again are more guarded, yet are supportive.

Overall, 6 of 10 situations show significance in one or more effects. No type of situation, i.e. social, professional or academic, stands out. Generally, male and female respondents alike tend toward supporting female endeavors, the males with a degree of hesitance, the females almost unequivocally. Responses do indicate however that both men and women understand that male success is still more expected and believable in our society. Both sexes seem to view female success as more serious and critical, a likely reason being that it has been and may still be sex-inappropriate. Men and women in this study show supportive attitudes that are non traditional, with the greatest difference between them being the extent of support.

The hypothesis under study is clearly not supported. Female respondents did not show a greater tendency to avoid success nor did they show greater anxiety. They did not support Horner's fear of success theory. Results are subject to many interpretations. The use of the Situational Attitude Scale format may not have affected the respondent as personally as thematic cues would have. Females may very well be able to afford to be positive and supportive toward other females who are successful. They need not be anxious since the success is not their own. This format may have provided an easy withdrawal mechanism in which women respondents were able to be supportive

and positive. Males were able to respond positively in most instances. The responses did not seem paternalistic, nor were they intolerant to changing sex roles. Males may have been able to respond as they did because they were not threatened by the successful women portrayed in the ten situations. Their hesitancy in some responses could have been caused by the novelty of the situations portraying achievement-oriented women or by a set requiring that they be tolerant of what has traditionally been sex inappropriate.

Situation V, which generated the most significance, may have done so because it is the most atypical, sex-inappropriate type of success for women included in this instrument. A female engineering head may be impinging on what has been most traditionally masculine; it seemed to have held a greater implication for all respondents than any other situation.

Limitations

Administration of this instrument must be replicated to determine if the effects are confined to the particular sample being studied. Many variations and changes could be made in the instruments and with samples to be tested. The successful situations could be re-worked since the situations used in this instrument may not have been indicative of success to the individuals surveyed. The selection of the bi-polar scales is also critical. Scales emphasizing different aspects other than the evaluative could yield very different results. That is, Osgood et al. (1957) discuss three types of items: evaluation, potency, and activity. Only the evaluation type of item was employed in this study.

Two further variations would be to incorporate pressure into the successful situation or to substitute power for success. The former would involve the family, social or professional pressures that oftentimes are a part of success, while the latter would present successful individuals as holding

power. Women may fear success because of the pressure attached to it, while men may fear women who are powerful. The situations should include success in other than strictly middle-class occupations or situations.

The sample being tested is also critical. In this study, for example, a sample of undergraduate (1st & 2nd year), or the general public, faculty, etc., may yield quite different results than those achieved by upperclass students.

Also, no data are generated concerning overt behavioral differences toward successful women. Hopefully, the SASWS provides a starting point by empirically demonstrating a difference in attitude that may be an indication of a difference in behavior.

References

Bardwick, J. M. Psychology of women: A study of bio-cultural conflicts. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, (1), 1-7.

French, E. G. & Lesser, G. S. Some characteristics of the achievement motive in women. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 48, 119-128.

Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. Sex-role identity and achievement motivation. Psychological Reports, 1963, 12, 483-490.

Herman, M. H. Stereotyping: Some effects on the stimulus person. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland, 1974.

Herman, M. H. & Sedlacek, W. E. Sexist attitudes among male university students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14, (6), 544-548.

Horner, M. S. Fail: Bright women. Psychology Today, November, 1969, 3, (16), 36-38, 62.

Horner, M. S. Toward an understanding of achievement related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, (2), 157-175.

Maccoby, E. Women's intellect. In S. M. Farber & R. H. L. Wilson (Eds.), The Potential of Women. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Howell, E. L. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton Century, 1953.

Mead, M. Male and female. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1949.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J. & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Sakoda, J. M., Cohen, B. H., & Beall, G. Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) manual. Chicago: Natresources, Inc., 1972.

Tresemer, D. Fear of success: Popular but unproven. Psychology Today, March, 1974, 7, (10), 82-85.

Table 1
Means,* Standard Deviations & Results of Analyses of Variance

ITEM NO.	Situations** Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Male Form A(N=11) Mean	Male Form A(N=11) S.D.	Male Form B(N=15) Mean	Male Form B(N=15) S.D.	Female Form A(N=17) Mean	Female Form A(N=17) S.D.	Female Form B(N=16) Mean	Female Form B(N=16) S.D.	Differences Significant at .05***
	I. TOP OF MEDICAL SCHOOL CLASS									
1	jealous-not jealous	3.00	.89	2.93	1.10	3.18	1.13	3.37	1.08	
2	indifferent-proud	1.64	1.28	2.26	1.28	2.12	1.58	2.18	1.32	
3	desirable-undesirable	1.00	0.89	0.86	0.74	1.12	.99	1.56	1.09	
4	pressured-complacent	2.27	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.41	1.12	2.00	1.32	
5	uncomfortable-comfortable	3.00	1.00	2.86	1.30	3.24	1.09	2.68	0.94	
6	pleased-displeased	1.09	0.83	0.86	.83	1.00	1.12	0.81	0.91	
7	dissatisfied-satisfied	2.81	0.75	2.66	1.04	2.64	1.16	2.88	1.14	
8	hopeful-despondent	1.00	0.89	1.06	0.59	1.17	1.07	1.12	0.96	
9	surprised-expected	2.36	1.28	2.06	0.88	2.70	0.84	2.75	1.00	S
10	threatened-neutral	3.63	0.67	3.26	1.16	3.00	1.17	2.81	1.27	
	II. MARRIAGE POSTPONEMENT FOR GRADUATE SCHOOL									
11	admiration-disgust	1.36	0.67	1.33	1.11	0.82	0.80	1.68	1.01	
12	conflict-comfort	2.18	0.75	2.06	1.16	2.47	1.28	1.56	0.96	
13	certain-ambivalent	1.72	0.46	1.33	0.72	1.29	1.05	1.93	0.92	FXS
14	rational-irrational	1.18	0.60	0.86	0.99	0.47	0.62	1.18	1.10	FXS
15	unsympathetic-sympathetic	2.54	1.29	2.46	1.24	3.00	0.93	2.75	0.86	
16	accepting-rejecting	0.45	0.68	1.00	1.20	0.70	0.92	1.18	1.16	
17	angry-pleased	2.72	0.90	2.40	0.91	3.05	0.74	2.25	1.06	F
18	sensible-stupid	1.00	0.77	1.40	1.05	0.47	0.62	1.31	1.30	F
19	undisturbed-disturbed	0.64	0.80	1.53	1.30	0.88	0.99	1.50	1.03	F
20	questioning-satisfied	2.36	1.21	2.00	1.25	2.53	1.33	1.63	1.15	

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).
** See Table 1 for complete situation.
*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed model effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and FXS as the interaction.

Table 1
Means,* Standard Deviations & Results of Analyses of Variance

ITEM NO.	Situations** Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Male Form A(N=11) Mean	Male Form A(N=11) S.D.	Male Form B(N=15) Mean	Male Form B(N=15) S.D.	Female Form A(N=17) Mean	Female Form A(N=17) S.D.	Female Form B(N=16) Mean	Female Form B(N=16) S.D.	Differences Significant at .05***
	III. BOOK PUBLICATION									
21	pleased-displeased	0.27	0.46	0.26	0.46	0.06	0.24	0.25	0.58	
22	ashamed-proud	3.54	0.52	3.46	0.74	3.58	0.80	3.56	0.72	
23	envious-unenvious	2.45	1.21	2.00	1.13	2.41	1.41	2.44	1.09	
24	rejecting-supportive	3.54	0.52	3.46	0.52	3.82	0.39	3.68	0.48	S
25	interested-disinterested	0.64	0.67	0.66	0.90	0.18	0.39	0.25	0.44	S
26	cynical-open	2.90	1.22	3.26	0.80	3.70	0.58	3.31	0.94	
27	approving-disapproving	1.00	1.34	0.17	0.39	0.73	1.10	0.25	0.44	S
28	significant-insignificant	0.82	0.75	0.82	1.07	0.86	0.83	0.50	0.63	
29	inappropriate-appropriate	3.09	0.83	2.86	0.91	3.17	0.80	3.31	0.60	
30	curious-not curious	1.00	1.18	0.46	0.64	0.64	1.15	0.68	1.14	
	IV. QUIT COLLEGE TO PUT MATE THROUGH GRADUATE SCHOOL									
31	disappointment-satisfaction	1.46	1.04	1.26	0.88	1.41	1.62	1.94	1.44	
32	angry-calm	2.09	0.70	2.18	1.51	2.46	1.18	2.62	1.08	
33	accepting-questioning	1.90	1.30	2.20	1.20	2.88	1.05	2.06	1.38	
34	agree-disagree	2.27	1.00	1.93	0.96	2.58	1.12	2.12	1.14	
35	uncertain-certain	2.00	1.18	1.73	1.10	1.47	1.18	1.75	1.44	
36	indifferent-concerned	2.46	1.04	2.80	0.86	2.82	1.01	2.94	0.85	
37	happy-sad	2.36	0.80	2.13	0.92	2.58	0.94	1.94	0.99	
38	ambivalent-satisfied	2.00	1.18	2.00	1.06	1.94	1.08	1.88	1.14	
39	acceptable-unacceptable	1.72	1.34	1.73	1.34	2.35	1.32	1.88	1.20	
40	comfortable-uncomfortable	2.09	0.94	2.00	1.06	2.41	1.18	2.00	1.21	

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).
** See Table 1 for complete situation.
*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed model effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and FXS as the interaction.

Table 1

Means,* Standard Deviations & Results of Analyses of Variance

ITEM NO.	Situations** Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Male Form A(N=11) Mean	Male Form A(N=11) S.D.	Male Form B(N=15) Mean	Male Form B(N=15) S.D.	Female Form A(N=17) Mean	Female Form A(N=17) S.D.	Female Form B(N=16) Mean	Female Form B(N=16) S.D.	Differences Significant at .05***
	V. HEAD OF ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT									
41	appropriate-inappropriate	1.00	1.05	0.80	0.78	0.28	0.58	1.42	0.85	F, FXS
42	unexpected-expected	1.20	1.14	2.73	1.16	1.61	1.42	3.36	1.00	F
43	unbelievable-believable	2.40	1.43	3.26	0.88	2.72	1.64	3.86	0.36	F
44	natural-unnatural	1.70	1.34	1.26	0.96	1.50	1.34	1.14	1.09	
45	encouraging-discouraging	1.10	1.10	1.40	0.82	0.22	0.54	2.28	0.91	F, FXS
46	hopeful-suspicious	1.00	1.24	1.46	0.92	0.38	0.69	2.14	0.77	F, FXS
47	pleased-displeased	1.00	1.15	1.20	0.94	0.22	0.54	1.92	0.62	F, FXS
48	optimistic-pessimistic	1.60	1.26	1.40	1.06	0.44	0.70	2.07	1.26	F, FXS
49	apprehensive-calm	2.30	1.42	2.86	1.06	2.94	1.30	2.57	1.16	
50	annoyed-gratified	2.40	0.84	2.00	0.38	3.50	0.78	1.78	0.98	F, S, FXS
	VI. SWIM CHAMP									
51	questioning-unquestioning	2.80	1.14	2.60	1.18	3.16	1.24	3.07	1.38	
52	inappropriate-appropriate	3.20	0.78	2.53	1.40	3.28	0.96	3.21	1.31	
53	pleased-disgusted	1.10	0.88	1.26	1.03	1.06	1.10	0.86	1.35	
54	positive-negative	0.80	0.92	1.26	0.96	0.88	1.08	0.92	1.32	
55	not resentful-resentful	0.60	0.70	0.86	0.92	0.44	0.70	0.64	1.33	
56	understanding-indignant	0.40	0.52	0.73	0.88	0.50	0.70	0.64	1.21	
57	frustrated-neutral	3.60	0.84	3.60	1.06	3.44	1.19	3.14	1.51	
58	good-bad	1.30	0.82	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.02	1.14	1.23	
59	comfortable-uncomfortable	0.70	0.82	0.80	0.86	0.78	1.06	0.78	1.31	
60	tolerant-intolerant	0.40	0.52	1.00	1.13	0.83	1.15	0.78	1.42	

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).

** See Table 1 for complete situation.

*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed model effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and FXS as the interaction.

Table 1
Means,* Standard Deviations & Results of Analyses of Variance

ITEM NO.	Situations** Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Male Form A(N=11) Mean	Male Form A(N=11) S.D.	Male Form B(N=15) Mean	Male Form B(N=15) S.D.	Female Form A(N=17) Mean	Female Form A(N=17) S.D.	Female Form B(N=16) Mean	Female Form B(N=16) S.D.	Differences Significant at .05***
	VII. JOB OFFER-MATE MOVE									
61	reasonable-unreasonable	1.60	1.43	1.46	1.12	1.11	1.83	1.64	1.00	
62	awkward-comfortable	1.20	1.03	1.73	1.28	2.00	1.37	1.42	0.85	
63	easy-difficult	2.60	1.08	2.46	1.06	2.83	1.38	3.14	1.02	
64	mutual-unilateral	1.30	1.42	2.00	1.06	1.28	1.04	2.28	1.06	F
65	pleased-outraged	1.50	0.97	1.73	1.03	1.11	0.96	2.21	0.89	F
66	bad-good	2.30	0.82	2.26	1.03	2.88	1.02	1.92	1.20	
67	doubt-certainty	1.40	0.96	2.00	0.92	1.88	1.13	1.50	1.34	
68	ambivalence-assurance	1.70	1.06	2.00	1.06	2.38	1.14	1.71	1.26	
69	admiration-disgust	1.50	0.85	1.46	0.64	0.83	0.98	2.00	1.10	F, FXS
70	regret-confidence	2.50	0.70	2.13	1.12	2.72	1.02	2.00	1.10	F
	VIII. SUMMA CUM LAUDE									
71	impressed-unimpressed	2.10	1.60	1.40	1.40	0.78	1.06	1.64	1.22	FXS
72	baffling-understandable	3.00	0.94	2.13	1.06	3.33	0.77	2.36	0.63	F
73	pity-proud	2.40	0.84	2.33	0.72	3.22	0.88	2.36	1.00	F, S
74	trivial-extraordinary	1.60	1.17	1.73	1.03	2.16	1.10	1.50	0.86	
75	threatening-unthreatening	2.80	1.32	2.60	0.82	3.16	0.98	2.50	1.09	
76	expected-unexpected	1.50	0.71	2.06	1.10	1.66	0.76	2.00	0.78	
77	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.90	0.99	2.33	0.82	3.06	0.87	2.21	1.31	F
78	acceptable-unacceptable	0.90	0.88	0.86	0.92	0.61	1.04	1.21	1.05	
79	important-unimportant	2.60	1.26	2.26	1.38	2.16	1.46	2.28	1.32	
80	envious-indifferent	2.80	1.40	2.66	1.29	2.33	1.14	2.64	1.39	

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).
** See Table 1 for complete situation.
*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed model effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and FXS as the interaction.

Table 1
Means,* Standard Deviations & Results of Analyses of Variance

ITEM NO.	Situations** Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Male Form A(N=11) Mean	Male Form A(N=11) S.D.	Male Form B(N=15) Mean	Male Form B(N=15) S.D.	Female Form A(N=17) Mean	Female Form A(N=17) S.D.	Female Form B(N=16) Mean	Female Form B(N=16) S.D.	Differences Significant at .05***
	IX. SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS AND SOCIAL LIFE									
81	suspicious-trusting	2.63	1.02	2.13	0.64	3.16	0.86	2.00	1.16	F
82	hostile-friendly	3.46	0.68	2.40	1.06	3.50	0.70	2.62	1.20	F
83	impressed-unimpressed	1.82	1.25	1.86	1.06	0.94	1.39	2.81	1.32	F, FXS
84	lucky-unlucky	1.81	0.87	1.73	0.70	1.28	0.90	1.68	0.70	
85	content-dissatisfied	1.18	1.16	1.80	0.94	0.83	0.92	1.55	1.15	F
86	cautious-receptive	2.72	1.10	2.00	1.30	3.38	0.70	1.56	1.20	F
87	desirable-undesirable	1.27	1.10	1.46	0.74	0.61	0.85	1.94	1.12	F, FXS
88	unfriendly-friendly	3.09	1.04	2.73	0.88	3.33	0.97	2.62	1.14	F
89	safe-unsafe	1.09	1.04	1.46	1.24	0.61	0.78	1.88	1.26	F
90	superior-inferior	1.81	0.40	2.13	0.64	1.66	0.90	1.81	0.66	
	X. LAWYER-SUPREME COURT									
91	supportive-rejecting	0.54	0.68	0.40	0.50	0.11	0.32	0.18	0.40	S
92	confident-unconfident	0.90	0.94	1.00	0.84	0.50	0.78	0.75	0.93	
93	significant-insignificant	0.46	0.68	0.86	0.92	0.44	0.86	0.44	0.72	
94	pleased-displeased	0.82	0.87	0.86	0.83	0.16	0.38	0.38	0.50	S
95	surprised-expected	2.28	0.90	1.93	1.03	2.38	1.24	2.44	1.15	
96	concerned-unconcerned	1.82	1.32	1.46	1.12	1.11	1.32	1.06	1.18	
97	unpressured-pressured	1.90	1.30	2.06	1.38	2.00	1.60	1.86	1.36	
98	hopeful-pessimistic	1.00	0.89	0.80	1.01	0.28	0.46	0.44	0.51	S
99	humorous-serious	3.09	1.04	2.26	1.16	3.33	0.84	2.81	0.98	F
100	comfortable-uncomfortable	1.00	1.10	1.46	1.12	0.56	0.86	1.25	1.06	F

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).
** See Table 1 for complete situation.
*** Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed model effects) with F (Form, A or B) and S (Sex, male or female) as main effects and FXS as the interaction.

APPENDIX

SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE - WOMEN SUCCESS

FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire is designed to measure how people think and feel about several social and personal incidents and situations. This instrument is anonymous so PLEASE DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

There are no right or wrong answers on this test. Answer each situation as honestly as you can. Each item (situation) from 1 through 10 is followed by ten word scales. You should respond to each scale by selecting which rating best describes your feelings about a certain situation.

EXAMPLE:

You have been accepted to graduate school.

happy A B C D E sad

You will indicate the extent and direction of your feelings by blackening in the appropriate corresponding letter on your answer sheet. For example, if you choose A above, you would be indicating you were very happy with the situation and would therefore mark A in the corresponding space on the answer sheet. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Some items may seem to be a repetition of those you have already answered. DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH THROUGH YOUR ITEMS. Make each and every item a distinct and independent response. Respond with your first impressions if you can and do not spend time puzzling over what you should respond to individual items. Be as honest as you can.

SITUATIONS

FORM A

I. You learn that Ann is at the top of her medical school class at the end of first term finals.

II. Your friend Jane decides to postpone her marriage to John and go to graduate school.

III. You learn that an old friend, Claire, has just published a book that is being received highly in academic circles.

IV. Debbie decides to quit college to put her husband through graduate school.

V. A female college professor has just been named Head of the Engineering Department at your university.

VI. Joan is a swimming champion at your college. She always asks her boyfriend to be at the swim meets to support her. You feel:

VII. Gloria has received a fantastic job offer with her company in another part of the country. She asks her husband to leave his job so she can accept her company's offer.

VIII. Donald's girlfriend graduated summa cum laude; he received no honors at all.

IX. JoAnn is a successful businesswoman. She has loads of dates and leads an active social life.

X. Barbara is a lawyer. She will be arguing her first case before the Supreme Court this term.

FORM B

I. You learn that Jim is at the top of his medical school class at the end of first term finals.

II. Your friend John decides to postpone his marriage to Jane and go to graduate school.

III. You learn that an old friend, Carl, has just published a book that is being received highly in academic circles.

IV. Dennis decides to quit college to put his wife through graduate school.

V. A male college professor has just been named Head of the Engineering Department at your university.

VI. John is a swimming champion at your college. He always asks his girlfriend to be at the swim meets to support him. You feel:

VII. Gordon has received a fantastic job offer with his company in another part of the country. He asks his wife to leave her job so he can accept his company's offer.

VIII. Donna's boyfriend graduated summa cum laude; she received no honors at all.

IX. Joe is a successful businessman. He has loads of dates and leads an active social life.

X. Bill is a lawyer. He will be arguing his first case before the Supreme Court this term.